

## SOURCE SELECTION SENSITIVE IAW FAR 2.101 and 3.104

Missile Defense Agency (MDA)

Source Selection Decision Document

Airborne Sensors Program

Request for Proposal HQ0147-09-R-0006

1. The Missile Defense Agency (MDA) has a continuing need for the Airborne Sensors (ABS) program, which provides airborne electro-optic and infrared sensor capability in support of the MDA and other test activities. The ABS program directs the design, development, integration, test, operation, maintenance, improvements, modernization, mission support and mission data reduction/analysis activities of the MDA High Altitude Observatory (HALO) I, II, and III aircrafts, and the Wide-body Airborne Sensor Platform (WASP) aircraft.

2. A Request For Proposal (RFP) for the ABS requirement was issued on March 19, 2010, with proposals due on May 18, 2010. Three (3) amendments were issued with no impact to the original proposal due date. Amendment Number 0001 was issued on April 23, 2010 to make changes to the Solicitation hastened by Industry questions and comments. RFP changes were made to: (1) Section B, (2) Section J, Attachment #1 Statement of Work (SOW), (3) Section J, Attachment #2 Mission Support Sample Task, (4) Section J, Attachment #12 Section L, (5) Section J, Attachment # 13, Section M, and (6) Section J, Attachment #15, Mission Support Pricing Instructions. Amendment Number 0002 was issued on May 17, 2010 to (1) add DCS Corp. to the list of non-Government advisors in Section L and (2) add the number 180 to Block 14 of the SF33. Lastly, Amendment Number 0003 was issued on June 28, 2010 to revise Section L paragraph 1.7 to (1) change company MEI Technology to MEI and (2) add ManTech to the list of non-Government advisors. Proposals were received from (b)(5)

(b)(5) for HALO, WASP and ABS Combined, (b)(5) for HALO and ABS Combined, (b)(5) for WASP, and (b)(5) for HALO.

3. The solicitation utilized a competitive, best value approach. In utilizing this approach, the Government intends to award to the Offeror or Offerors providing MDA the greatest confidence that it will best meet the Government's requirements in an affordable manner. All proposals received were subject to four (4) evaluation factors: Technical, Management, Past and Present Performance, and Cost/Price. Color and proposal risk ratings were assigned at the Technical and Management subfactor level. Past and Present Performance was evaluated with an overall performance confidence rating. Cost/Price was evaluated for reasonableness and realism and considered part of

the integrated assessment of best value. Award will be made to the Offeror or Offerors whose proposal(s) are considered most advantageous to the Government based upon an integrated assessment of the evaluation factors and subfactors. The Technical and Management Factors are of equal importance, with Past and Present Performance next, and Cost/Price the least important factor. The Technical subfactors: Mission Support, Mission Assurance, and Technical Development, are in descending order of importance. The Management subfactors: Management Approach, Transition, Staffing, Facilities, and Small Business Subcontracting and Commitment, are of equal importance. The non-cost factors, when combined, are significantly more important than cost/price, but cost/price contributed substantially to the Source Selection decision. The Government will select the best value proposal by either awarding two contracts; one for the HALO effort and one for the WASP effort, or a single contract for the entire ABS effort.

4. After review and consideration of the Competitive Range Brief for ABS presented on September 20, 2010, along with backup documentation provided by the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) and Source Selection Advisory Council (SSAC), I approved the recommendation from the PCO that (b)(5) should be excluded from the competitive range. (b)(5) was notified that they were excluded from the competitive range on September 27, 2010. (b)(5) accepted the government's decision and IAW FAR 15.505 decided to wait until after contract award for a debrief. The Government entered into discussions with the remaining Offerors still in the competitive range on September 27, 2010 that concluded on November 16, 2010. Discussions included three iterations of evaluation notices (ENs) and two rounds of oral discussions. The Offerors' responses were evaluated by the Source Selection Evaluation Team (SSET) in accordance with the evaluation criteria contained in Section M of the solicitation. Final Proposal Revision Requests (FPR) were sent on December 3, 2010 and due December 17, 2010. After review and analysis of the FPRs received, discussions were re-opened on February 1, 2011 and ended on February 15, 2011. A request for second FPR was sent on February 17, 2011 and received on February 28, 2011.

5. Below are the Offeror's ratings for Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance and the proposed and most probable Cost/Price for the HALO effort:

**HALO**

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

**Factor 1: Technical**

SF1: Mission Support  
SF2: Mission Assurance  
SF3: Technical Development

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Low  
Acceptable/Low  
Acceptable/Moderate

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Low  
Acceptable/Low  
Marginal/Moderate

**Factor 2: Management**

SF1: Management Approach  
SF2: Transition  
SF3: Staffing  
SF4: Facilities  
SF5: Small Business

**Rating/Risk**

Excellent/Low  
Excellent/Low  
Excellent/Low  
Excellent/Low  
Excellent/Low

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Moderate  
Acceptable/Low  
Acceptable/Low  
Acceptable/Low  
Excellent/Low

**Factor 3: Past and Present Performance**

Exceptional/High Confidence

Very Good/Significant Confidence

**Factor 4: Cost/Price**

Proposed  
Probable

(b)(4)

(b)(4)

6. The SSET evaluation results show that (b)(5) had the most advantageous proposal to the Government. In particular the SSET concluded that the (b)(5) proposal was more advantageous to the Government, over (b)(5) with regards to the Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance Factors all at a lower most probable Cost/Price.

Factor 1: Technical (Subfactors in descending order of importance)

Technical Subfactor 1: Mission Support (Advantage: Neutral)

Both (b)(5) and (b)(5) proposals met six of six evaluation criteria for Mission Support and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Technical Subfactor 2: Mission Assurance (Advantage: Neutral)

Both (b)(5) and (b)(5) HALO proposals met ten of ten evaluation criteria for Mission Assurance and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Technical Subfactor 3: Technical Development (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) HALO proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with MODERATE risk. The (b)(5) HALO

proposal met two and did not clearly meet two of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated YELLOW (MARGINAL) with MODERATE risk.

Factor 2: Management (Subfactors are equal in importance)

Management Subfactor 1: Management Approach (Advantage: (b)(5))  
The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded two and met eight of ten evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) HALO proposal met nine and did not clearly meet one of ten evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with MODERATE risk.

Management Subfactor 2: Transition (Advantage: (b)(5))  
The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded one and met two of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) HALO proposal met three of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with Low risk.

Management Subfactor 3: Staffing (Advantage: (b)(5))  
The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) HALO proposal met one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with Low risk.

Management Subfactor 4: Facilities (Advantage: (b)(5))  
The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded three and met one of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) HALO proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with Low risk.

Management Subfactor 5: Small Business (Advantage: Neutral)  
The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded four of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) HALO proposal exceeded four of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk.

Factor 3: Past and Present Performance (Advantage: (b)(5))  
The (b)(5) HALO performance confidence assessment rating was EXCEPTIONAL / HIGH CONFIDENCE. The (b)(5) HALO performance confidence assessment rating was VERY GOOD / SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE.

Factor 4: Cost/Price (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) HALO proposed cost and Government Most Probable Cost (MPC) are equal (b)(4) and are less than both the (b)(5) HALO proposed cost (b)(4) and Government MPC (b)(4). I concur with the SSET's and SSAC's recommendation to upwardly adjust (b)(5) HALO proposed cost. The (b)(4) in adjustments were primarily due to the unrealistic assumptions made in the complexity of the effort and repair time assumptions, unjustified maintenance hours realignment, and for not addressing the O&S for optical windows. These issues are specifically documented in the technical evaluation by WBS item and summarized in the cost report. For example, the O&S labor proposed in the basis of estimate for the HALO I Airborne Pointing System (APS)/TSPShooter was supported by a comparison to the WASP Sensor Support Subsystem (SSS). Raytheon's BOE is based upon actual hours used to maintain the SSS (870 hours per year) multiplied by a complexity factor of 30 percent. RTSC's 30% complexity factor grossly understates the complexity of the APS/TSP Shooter. While the APS/TSP shooter performs many of the same functions as the SSS, such as receiving uplinked pointing information and providing situational awareness, the APS/TSPShooter also calculates gimbal axis commands for up to 4 gimbals while the SSS simply passes state vectors. Due to the increased complexity and functionality the Government technical team estimated a realistic complexity factor of the APS/TSPShooter to be twice that of the SSS. The Government did not agree with the average repair time assumptions used in the basis of estimates. As an example, the basis of estimate for the HALO II Sensor assumes the average repair time to be six hours based on 80 percent of discrepancies being resolved in two hours, 15 percent in 16 hours, and five percent in 40 hours. The Government did not consider this assumption to be realistic and used a conservative estimate of 18 hours for the average repair time. (b)(5) asserted that hours from Mission Support needed to be re-aligned to O&S because they were for maintenance. The Mission Support basis of estimate task descriptions did not address maintenance; therefore, the Government disagreed with the re-alignment of hours as proposed. The Government also added hours to account for O&S for the HALO optical windows. These upward adjustments resulted in a MPC that is (b)(4) higher than the proposed cost, with (b)(4) of the adjustment being made to O&S.

7. The SSET and SSAC have recommended the (b)(5) HALO proposal to be more advantageous to the Government than the (b)(5) HALO proposal for all four factors. I have compared the proposals giving appropriate consideration to the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation and their relative importance. Based upon this comparison of the proposals and a detailed assessment of the advantages and disadvantages associated with each, I have determined that the HALO proposal submitted by (b)(5) provides the best value to the Government if an award for HALO is made.

8. Below are the Offeror's ratings for Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance and the proposed and most probable Cost/Price for the WASP effort:

<b>WASP</b>	(b)(5)	(b)(5)
<b>Factor 1: Technical</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>
SF1: Mission Support	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF2: Mission Assurance	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF3: Technical Development	Acceptable/Moderate	Marginal/Moderate
<b>Factor 2: Management</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>
SF1: Management Approach	Excellent/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF2: Transition	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF3: Staffing	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF4: Facilities	Acceptable/ Low	Acceptable/Low
SF5: Small Business	Excellent/Low	Excellent/Low
<b>Factor 3: Past and Present Performance</b>	Exceptional/High Confidence	Very Good/Significant Confidence
<b>Factor 4: Cost/Price</b>		
Proposed	(b)(4)	(b)(4)
Probable		

9. The SSET evaluation results show that the (b)(5) WASP proposal was more advantageous than the (b)(5) WASP proposal. This is based on the (b)(5) proposal being considered more advantageous to the Government than the (b)(5) proposal for all three rated factors; Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance. Per RFP Section M 4.0 Evaluation, "The lowest priced proposal may not necessarily receive the award." In a best value comparison, the rating advantage of (b)(5) proposal outweighs the cost difference of (b)(4) for the total MPC.

Factor 1: Technical (Subfactors in descending order of importance)

Technical Subfactor 1: Mission Support (Advantage: Neutral)

Both (b)(4) and (b)(5) WASP proposals met six of six evaluation criteria for Mission Support and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Technical Subfactor 2: Mission Assurance (Advantage: Neutral)

Both (b)(5) and (b)(5) WASP proposals met ten of ten evaluation criteria for Mission Assurance and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Technical Subfactor 3: Technical Development (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) WASP proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with MODERATE risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal met two and did not clearly meet two of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated YELLOW (MARGINAL) with MODERATE risk.

**Factor 2: Management (Subfactors are equal in importance)**

**Management Subfactor 1: Management Approach (Advantage: (b)(5))**  
The (b)(5) WASP proposal exceeded two and met eight of ten evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal met ten of ten evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Management Subfactor 2: Transition (Neutral)**  
The (b)(5) WASP proposal met three of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal met three of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Management Subfactor 3: Staffing (Advantage: Neutral)**  
The (b)(5) WASP proposal met one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal met one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Management Subfactor 4: Facilities (Neutral)**  
The (b)(5) WASP proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Management Subfactor 5: Small Business (Advantage: Neutral)**  
The (b)(5) WASP proposal exceeded two and met two of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) WASP proposal exceeded four of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk.

**Factor 3: Past and Present Performance (Advantage: (b)(5))**  
The (b)(5) WASP performance confidence assessment rating was EXCEPTIONAL / HIGH CONFIDENCE. The (b)(5) WASP performance confidence assessment rating was VERY GOOD / SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE.

Factor 4: Cost/Price (Advantage: (b)(5))  
 For the Cost/Price Factor, the (b)(5) WASP proposed cost (b)(4) and Government MPC (b)(4) are both less than the (b)(5) WASP proposed cost (b)(4) and Government MPC (b)(4). I concur with the SSET's and SSAC's recommendation to upwardly adjust (b)(5) WASP proposed cost. The (b)(4) in adjustments were due to unexplained reductions in hours for the WASP Enclosure Environmental Control System, unrealistic hours for WASP PSS, and unjustified hours realignment for maintenance. (b)(5) asserted that hours from Mission Support needed to be re-aligned to O&S because they were for maintenance. Since the Mission Support basis of estimate task descriptions did not address maintenance, the Government did not agree with their proposal to re-align the hours because it is not justified. I also concur with the SSET's and SSAC's recommendation to upwardly adjust (b)(5) WASP proposed cost. This (b)(4) adjustment was due to a mismatch between the BOE hours and those listed in Cost Format A hours proposed. Since the technical evaluation was based on the BOE hours, the MPC was adjusted to reflect the total hours justified in the BOEs.

10. The SSET and SSAC have recommended the (b)(5) WASP proposal to be more advantageous to the Government than the (b)(5) WASP proposal. This is based on the (b)(5) proposal being considered more advantageous to the Government than the (b)(5) WASP proposal for all three rated factors. I have determined the combination of the technical superiority, overall business approach, and superior past and present performance outweighs the 5.9 percent higher MPC. I have compared the proposals giving appropriate consideration to the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation and their relative importance. Based upon this comparison of the proposals and a detailed assessment of the advantages and disadvantages associated with each, I have determined that the WASP proposal submitted by (b)(5) provides the best value to the Government if an award for WASP is made.

11. Below are the Offeror's ratings for Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance and the proposed and most probable Cost/Price for the ABS Combined effort:

**ABS Combined**

(b)(5)

(b)(5)

**Factor 1: Technical**

SF1: Mission Support

SF2: Mission Assurance

SF3: Technical Development

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Low

Acceptable/Low

Acceptable/Moderate

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Low

Acceptable/Low

Marginal/Moderate



**Factor 2: Management**

SF1: Management Approach  
 SF2: Transition  
 SF3: Staffing  
 SF4: Facilities  
 SF5: Small Business

**Rating/Risk**

Excellent/Low  
 Acceptable/Low  
 Excellent/Low  
 Excellent/Low  
 Excellent/Low

**Rating/Risk**

Acceptable/Moderate  
 Acceptable/Low  
 Acceptable/Low  
 Excellent/Low  
 Excellent/Low

**Factor 3: Past and Present Performance**

Exceptional/High  
 Confidence

Very Good/Significant  
 Confidence

**Factor 4: Cost/Price**

Proposed  
 Probable

(b)(4)

(b)(4)

12. The SSET evaluation results show that (b)(5) had a more advantageous ABS Combined proposal than (b)(5) with a more advantageous ratings in Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance and a lower MPC. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposed cost was not considered realistic.

**Factor 1: Technical (Subfactors in descending order of importance)****Technical Subfactor 1: Mission Support (Advantage: Neutral)**

Both (b)(5) and (b)(5) ABS Combined proposals met six of six evaluation criteria for Mission Support and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Technical Subfactor 2: Mission Assurance (Advantage: Neutral)**

Both (b)(5) and (b)(5) ABS Combined proposals met ten of ten evaluation criteria for Mission Assurance and were rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

**Technical Subfactor 3: Technical Development (Advantage: (b)(5))**

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met four of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with MODERATE risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met two and did not clearly meet two of four evaluation criteria for Technical Development and was rated YELLOW (MARGINAL) with MODERATE risk.

**Factor 2: Management (Subfactors are equal in importance)****Management Subfactor 1: Management Approach (Advantage: (b)(5))**

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded two and met eight of ten evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met nine and did not clearly meet one of ten

evaluation criteria for Management Approach and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Management Subfactor 2: Transition (Advantage: Neutral)

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met three of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met three of three evaluation criteria for Transition and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Management Subfactor 3: Staffing (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal met one of one evaluation criteria for Staffing and was rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) with LOW risk.

Management Subfactor 4: Facilities (Advantage: Neutral)

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded three and met one of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded one and met three of four evaluation criteria for Facilities and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk.

Management Subfactor 5: Small Business (Advantage: Neutral)

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded four of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal exceeded four of four evaluation criteria for Small Business and was rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) with LOW risk.

Factor 3: Past and Present Performance (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) ABS Combined performance confidence assessment rating was EXCEPTIONAL / HIGH CONFIDENCE. The (b)(5) ABS Combined performance confidence assessment rating was VERY GOOD / SIGNIFICANT CONFIDENCE.

Factor 4: Cost/Price (Advantage: (b)(5))

The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposed cost and Government MPC equal (b)(4) and are less than the (b)(5) ABS Combined Government MPC (b)(5). The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposed cost (b)(4) was not considered realistic for the work to be performed without a significant upward adjustment to the labor hours. The (b)(4) in adjustments were due to the unrealistic assumptions made in the complexity of the effort and repair time assumptions, unexplained hours reduction for WASP Enclosure Environmental Control System O&S, unrealistic hours proposed for the WASP Primary Sensor System O&S, unjustified maintenance hours realignment, and for not addressing the O&S for HALO optical windows. These issues are specifically

documented in the technical evaluation by WBS item and summarized in the cost report. As an example, the O&S labor proposed in the basis of estimate for the HALO I Airborne Pointing System (APS)/TSPShooter was supported by a comparison to the WASP Sensor Support Subsystem (SSS). The proposal states the APS/TSPShooter is 60 percent as complex as the WASP SSS. Additionally, a maturity factor of 50 percent was used indicating the APS/TSPShooter would require 50 percent of the maintenance compared to the WASP SSS due to its maturity. The combination of these two factors, complexity and maturity, resulted in an estimating factor of 30 percent. The Government did not consider these assumptions to be realistic and used a factor of 200 percent. The Government did not agree with the average repair time assumptions used in the basis of estimates. As an example, the basis of estimate for the HALO I Sensors assumes the average repair time to be 4.3 hours based on 80 percent of discrepancies being resolved in one hour, 15 percent in 10 hours, and five percent in 40 hours. The Government did not consider this assumption to be realistic and used a conservative estimate of 18 hours for the average repair time. (b)(5) asserted that hours from Mission Support needed to be re-aligned to O&S because they were for maintenance. The Mission Support basis of estimate task descriptions did not address maintenance; therefore, the Government disagreed with the re-alignment of hours. The Government also added hours to account for O&S for the HALO optical windows. The upward adjustments resulted in a MPC that is (b)(4) higher than the proposed cost, with (b)(4) of the adjustment being made to O&S.

13. The SSET and SSAC have recommended the (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal to be more advantageous to the Government than the (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal for all four factors. I have compared the proposals giving appropriate consideration to the evaluation criteria set forth in the solicitation and their relative importance. Based upon this comparison of the proposals and a detailed assessment of the advantages and disadvantages associated with each, I have determined that the ABS Combined proposal submitted by (b)(5) provides the best value to the Government if an award for ABS Combined is made.

14. Below are the Offeror's ratings for Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance and the proposed and most probable Cost/Price for the two award alternative (HALO and WASP) and the single award alternative (ABS Combined):

Alternative Comparison	Two Award Alternative		Single Award Alternative
	(b)(5) HALO	(b)(5) WASP	(b)(5) ABS Combined
<b>Factor 1: Technical</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>
SF1: Mission Support	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF2: Mission Assurance	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF3: Technical Development	Acceptable/Moderate	Acceptable/Moderate	Acceptable/Moderate
<b>Factor 2: Management</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>	<b>Rating/Risk</b>
SF1: Management Approach	Excellent/Low	Excellent/Low	Excellent/Low
SF2: Transition	Excellent/Low	Acceptable/Low	Acceptable/Low
SF3: Staffing	Excellent/Low	Acceptable/Low	Excellent/Low
SF4: Facilities	Excellent/Low	Acceptable/Low	Excellent/Low
SF5: Small Business	Excellent/Low	Excellent/Low	Excellent/Low
<b>Factor 3: Past and Present Performance</b>	Exceptional/High Confidence	Exceptional/High Confidence	Exceptional/High Confidence
<b>Factor 4: Cost/Price</b>			
Proposed	(b)(4)	(b)(4)	(b)(4)
	HALO + WASP =		
Probable	(b)(4)		(b)(4)
	HALO + WASP =		

15. The SSET evaluation results show that the single award alternative of (b)(5) ABS Combined is more advantageous to the Government than the two award alternative of (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP. The single award alternative of (b)(5) had better ratings in Management and had a lower MPC.

For the Technical Factor, a single award for the (b)(5) ABS Combined is essentially the same as two awards for (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP due to (b)(5) and (b)(5) teaming on both the WASP and ABS Combined proposals. They proposed the same solutions and received identical color and risk ratings. The Technical Factor is of equal importance as the Management Factor and more important than the Past and Present Performance Factor and the Cost/Price Factor.

For the Management Factor, a single award for (b)(5) ABS Combined is considered more advantageous to the Government than the two award alternative for (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP. The single award alternative is slightly more advantageous for the Staffing subfactor. This advantage is due to (b)(5) ABS Combined Staffing bring rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT) while the two award alternative is a combination of (b)(5) HALO PURPLE (EXCELLENT) and (b)(5) WASP GREEN (ACCEPTABLE). All other color and risk ratings for Management Subfactors are considered equivalent. The Management Subfactors are of equal importance. The Management Factor is of equal importance as the Technical Factor and more important than the Past and Present Performance Factor and the Cost/Price Factor.

For the Past and Present Performance Factor, a single award for the (b)(5) ABS Combined is essentially the same as two awards for (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP due to (b)(5) and (b)(5) teaming on both the WASP and ABS Combined proposals. All three proposals received a Performance Confidence Assessment Rating of EXCEPTIONAL/HIGH CONFIDENCE. EXCEPTIONAL/HIGH CONFIDENCE is defined as "essentially no doubt exists that the Offeror will successfully perform the required effort". The Past and Present Performance Factor is less important than the Technical and Management Factors but more important than the Cost/Price Factor.

For the Cost/Price Factor, the single award alternative of (b)(5) ABS Combined has a lower Government MPC than the sum of the (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP combined Government MPC by (b)(4) for the ten year period. The Cost/Price Factor is significantly less important than the combination of the Technical, Management, and Past and Present Performance Factors, but Cost/Price will contribute substantially to the Source Selection decision.

16. I consider the single award alternative of (b)(5) ABS Combined more advantageous to the Government than the two award alternative of (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal is essentially the combination of the (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP proposal since they teamed on the WASP and ABS Combined proposals. Therefore, the Technical and Past and Present Performance Factors are identical for the one award and two award alternatives. The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal received a higher color rating for the Staffing Subfactor than the sum of the (b)(5) HALO and (b)(5) WASP proposal. This difference is due to (b)(5) (b)(5) staffing approach being rated GREEN (ACCEPTABLE) while both (b)(5) proposals were rated PURPLE (EXCELLENT). The (b)(5) staffing approach used for the HALO and ABS Combined proposals utilized personnel who were already employees of the companies on the proposal teams. This approach exceeded the evaluation criteria. The (b)(5) staffing approach for WASP required hiring for two positions, including the WASP Program Manager. The staffing approach was GREEN (ACCEPTABLE). Since the alternatives are nearly the same for the three rated factors,

the Cost/Price Factor is the deciding factor. The efficiencies of managing HALO and WASP on one contract resulted in a significantly lower MPC for the (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal. I have determined that the single award alternative of (b)(5) ABS Combined is the best value alternative based on a higher Management Factor rating and a significantly lower Total Evaluated Probable Cost.

RFP Section M 4.0 states: "The Government considers there to be significant risk (i.e. technical expertise for both platforms) associated with awarding one contract for the entire ABS effort. Offerors must clearly substantiate their rationale that awarding one contract for the total effort does not present a higher risk to the Government than awarding one contract for the HALO effort and one contract for the WASP effort." The (b)(5) ABS Combined proposal demonstrated expertise for both HALO and WASP. This expertise was primarily achieved by creating a team with strong past and present performance and experience for both HALO and WASP. Therefore, I have determined that awarding one contract for the total effort to (b)(5) does not present a higher risk to the Government than awarding one contract for the HALO effort and one contract for the WASP.

(b)(6)

SOURCE SELECTION AUTHORITY